

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginis 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

 APPLICATION NO.
 FILING DATE
 FIRST NAMED INVENTOR
 ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
 CONFIRMATION NO.

 09/915,426
 07/26/2001
 Martin Kessler
 1703
 6991

 7590
 08/20/2003
 08/20/2003
 08/20/2003
 08/20/2003

STRIKER, STRIKER & STENBY 103 East Neck Road Huntington, NY 11743 EXAMINER
DUDA, RINA I

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
2837

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· ·	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	CAL
Advisory Action	09/915,426	KESSLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Rina I Duda	2837	
The MAILING DATE of this communic	ation appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 18 June 2003 FAILS TO F Therefore, further action by the applicant is req final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR	uired to avoid abandonment of the e either: (1) a timely filed amendme of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (	is application. A proper replacent which places the application	ly to a ation in
PERIOD	FOR REPLY [check either a) or	b)]	
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the m	-		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing dat event, however, will the statutory period for reply e ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST R 706.07(f).	xpire later than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ling date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136 have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the pe 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the date of the control of the contro	riod of extension and the corresponding am ne shortened statutory period for reply origin	ount of the fee. The appropriate extenally set in the final Office action; or (2	nsion fee under 2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension there			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be	entered because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would red	uire further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (s	see Note below);		
(c)  they are not deemed to place the ap issues for appeal; and/or	plication in better form for appeal	l by materially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims with	out canceling a corresponding nur	mber of finally rejected claim	ıs.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the follow			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) application in condition for allowance be		een considered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be cons raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		SOLELY to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed are explanation of how the new or amended	· / / —	•	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) a	s follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-9.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed or	ı <u>18 June 2003</u> is a)	or b) disapproved by the	Examiner.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

Rina I Duda Primary Exer Art Unit



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendment does not address all the issues raised in the final action, the USC 112 first paragraph rejection of claim 7 was not considered by applicant, as stated in the final action the entire disclosure (description of the invention and drawings) does not support the subject matter of claim 7. Also, the USC 112 second paragraph rejection of claims 8 and 9 was not address. Finally, the examiner still believes that the applied prior art shows all the structural limitations as recited in claims 1, 3-6, and 8.